

Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action of March 11, 2009.

At the time of the Office Action claims 1-21 were pending. All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Nachman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0027474) in view of Streble et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205119). Also, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Also, the specification of the application was objected to.

Applicants representative would like to thank the Examiner for his courtesy and consideration extended during the May 5, 2009 telephone interview. During the telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that it may be possible to overcome the rejection by amending the independent claims to include the limitations of dependent claims 4, 5 and 10. The above amendments to the independent claims include the limitations of claims 4 and 10, but not those of claim 5, which Applicants believe are not necessary for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims should be allowable as discussed below.

Concerning the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 has been amended to explicitly recite that the software product controls a processor unit of the first unit. Furthermore, claim 20 explicitly recites that the confidence component belongs to the second family of applications and includes instructions to control the processor of the first unit to perform the steps recited in the claim. Accordingly, it is believed that amended claim 20 fully conforms with 35 U.S.C. §101, as explained in the guidelines in M.P.E.P. §2106.01. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the Examiner believes that the term “a memory” is not disclosed in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20, not claim 21, recited a memory, and it is thus believed that the Examiner intended to apply this rejection against claim 20. In any event, the term “a

memory” has been deleted from claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

With regard to the objection to the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that the term “software product” refers generally to the software for implementing the method recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that it is not necessary for the specification to explicitly include the term “software product,” and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

Concerning the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection based on in view of Streble, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims should be allowable. As discussed in the Remarks of the previously filed Amendment, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious combine the teachings of Streble, which relate to effective analysis of web servers, with the teachings of Nachman, which relate to instant messaging between viewers of the same web page. In addition, Applicants submit that neither Streble nor Nachman relates to providing a secured transmission of information from a user in the manner according to the claimed embodiments of the present invention.

Also, as indicated above, the independent claims are being amended to recite “limitations” on the communications imposed by the first unit. As would be understood by one skilled in the art, these limitations may include, for example, a marking on the data packets, or a blockage of access to the network, or other limitations, as described in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that Streble and Nachman fail to teach or suggest this feature.

Furthermore, Applicants note that the features of claims 4 and 10, which were identified by the Examiner, have been added to independent claims 1, 20 and 21. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that Streble and Nachman fail to teach or suggest these features.

In re Appln. of De Boursetty et al.
Application No. 10/539,456
RCE and Response to Final Office Action of March 11, 2009

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark bergner/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Joseph J. Buczynski, Reg. No. 35,084
Mark Bergner, Reg. No. 45,877
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: June 11, 2009

CH01/ 25333307.1